



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/957,401	09/19/2001	Herbert J. Neuhaus	5542.02	4724

20686 7590 01/29/2002

DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP
SUITE 4700
370 SEVENTEENTH STREET
DENVER, CO 80202-5647

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, ALEXANDER O

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/957,401	NEUHAUS ET AL.
Period for Reply	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexander O Williams	2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-93 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-93 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Application/Control Number: 09/957,401
Art Unit: 2826

Page 2

Serial Number: 09/957401 Attorney's Docket #: 5542.02
Filing Date: 9/19/00;

Applicant: Neuhaus et al.

Examiner: Alexander Williams

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 26 to 48 and 66 to 85 drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in Class 257, subclass 728.

II. Claims 1 to 25, 49 to 65 and 86 to 93 , drawn to a process of a semiconductor device, classified in Class 438, subclass 15+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, unpatentability of the group I invention would not necessarily imply unpatentability of the method of the group II invention, since the device of the group I invention could be made by processes materially different than that of the group II invention, for example, instead of attaching the at least. One electrically conductive hard particle comprises an electroless metal-particle co-deposition process, it can performed by CVD process.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and, as shown by the above different classifications, the fields of search are not co-extensive and separate examination would be required, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. § 1.143).

Applicant is reminded of the notice published in the Official Gazette on March 26, 1996, "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in Light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)." If, in response to a requirement for election between a product and a process of making, Applicant elects claims to the product, and the product is subsequently found

Art Unit: 2826

allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from, or otherwise include, all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. Those process claims which do not depend from, or otherwise include, all the limitations of the allowable product will not be rejoined. Rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability under 37 CFR § 1.104 to 1.106. Process claims which depend from, or otherwise include, all the limitations of a patentable product claim will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection. Rejoinder does not constitute a withdrawal of the requirement for restriction (but is a new procedure authorized under the OG notice).

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the Group 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4-5B15. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2800 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 or 24. Only Papers related to GROUP 2800 APPLICATIONS SHOULD BE FAXED to the GROUP 2800 FAX CENTER.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to ***Examiner Alexander Williams*** whose telephone number is ***(703) 308-4863***.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the ***Group 2800 receptionist*** whose telephone number is ***(703) 308-0956***.

1/25/02



Primary Patent Examiner
Alexander O. Williams